

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		22/04/2014	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		27/03/2014	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Carlos Martin				2014/1041/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
93 Parkhill Road London NW3 2XY				Refer tod raft decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of rear dormer, enlargement of side dormer and installation of front rooflight.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	03	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Press notice published from 06/03/2014 to 27/03/2014 Site notice displayed from 05/03/2014 to 26/03/2014  No response.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		Parkhill CAAC: Objects on the following grounds:  <i>The property is unspoiled and retains its original features, as do most of the houses in this group. It is prominently sited on a corner and we object to any alteration to the original side dormer. We would not object to the rear dormer if it was modest in size and sympathetic in design.</i>					

## Site Description

Application site relates to a 2-storey end of terraced house located on the west side of Parkhill Road. The site is located within the Parkhill CA.

## Relevant History

2006/2266/P: Addition of rear dormer and enlargement of side dormer. Granted 07/07/2006.

PE9800408: The enlargement of a side dormer in connection with alterations to the loft space. Alteration at roof level in including the end enlargement of a side dormer and the roof light the front slope of the roof. Refused 13/08/1998.

Reasons for refusal: *The proposed roof extension would be contrary to the Council's policy for the control of additions at roof level within the Conservation Area. It would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.* (This dormer was proposed to extend up to ridge height)

## Relevant policies

### **NPPF 2012**

### **The London Plan 2011**

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010**

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

CPG1 (Design)

CPG6 (Amenity)

### **Parkhill and Upper Park conservation area appraisal and management 2011**

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for to enlarge the existing side dormer, to erect a new dormer to the rear and to install velux rooflight to the front roof slope.

The existing side dormer measures 2.26m wide and 0.9m tall. The proposed enlargement would result in a dormer 2.2m wide but its height would increase to 1.45m tall and it would lie closer to the front and rear pitch of the roof. The proposed new rear dormer would be 1.7m wide by 1.6m high and would feature a matching multipane window. The new rooflight would be 0.8m wide by 0.8m high.

### Main planning considerations

The main planning considerations relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, the group of which it forms part and the surrounding Parkhill Conservation Area as well as the impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding residential properties.

### Background

The proposal is identical to the scheme approved in July 2006. That application was assessed under the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2006, Camden's Supplementary Planning Guidance 2006 and the Parkhill conservation area statement. It was considered acceptable on the basis that the proposed dormer broadly complied with the requirements of the Unitary Development Plan 2006, with particular regard to policies B1, B3, B7, SD6.

In the intervening period between the original application and the current application, all the three documents cited above have been replaced. The new Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies documents were adopted in 2010 and the following year the Camden's Planning Guidance and the Parkhill conservation area appraisal were adopted. While the built up surroundings of the application's site do not appear to present significant changes, the new policy framework has a stronger emphasis on conservation. Any development within conservation areas as not only require to not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area in question but also to "preserve it and enhance" it.

### Design and conservation

Policy DP24 of the LDF states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;*
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;*
- c) the quality of materials to be used;*

In addition, paragraph 24.13 states, "*Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. (...) Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions*".

Policy DP25 of the LDF states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area. Paragraph 5.6 of CPG 1 (Design) states that roof extensions and alterations are likely to be *unacceptable* where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

The Parkhill Conservation Area Appraisal advises that *“proposals for dormers within the conservation area will be considered on their own merit. Dormer windows may be allowed at the rear, subject to Camden Planning Guidance (CPG). Particular care is needed to ensure sensitive and unobtrusive design to visible roof slopes or where roofs are prominent in long distance views.”*

While it is acknowledged that there are a number of unsympathetic dormers in the surrounding area, this particular site is located at end of terrace and its roof is visible and prominent in the public realm. Both the proposed enlarged side dormer and the new rear dormer fail to comply with current planning guidance, as they are not situated at a minimum distance of 0.5m from the roof edges, which results in the new dormers cutting across the original roof lines when viewed from ground level. The location of the dormers so close to the edges of the roof would result in overly excessive and bulky roof extensions in terms of their scale and proportions and visible from the public realm. They would not appear subordinate and generally upset the balance and coherence of the surrounding roofscape, thus harming the appearance of the host building and the composition of which it forms part.

The erection of a rear dormer window in this location is not considered to be unacceptable in principle. However, given the location of the property within a conservation area and the advice set in the Parkhill CA appraisal, any new dormer is expected to comply with CPG1 guidelines.

By virtue of their scale, proportions and siting the proposed dormers would create an unacceptably obtrusive and incongruous form of development, and would harm the appearance of the existing roofline. Moreover, in terms of respecting local character, policy justification states that past alterations and extensions should not be regarded as a precedent. On this basis it is considered to harm the historic character and appearance of the group of which it forms part and the wider conservation area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the design guidance of CPG 1 (Design) and policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

### **Amenity**

No amenity concerns are raised by the proposal. The proposed dormers and rooflight are therefore considered to be in compliance with policy DP26 and CPG guidelines and are acceptable on amenity terms.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission.